DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 593 CG 010 419

AUTHOR Porrer, Stephen E.; And Others
TITLE Measuring Japanese Racial Attitudes. Research Report 4-75.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Cultural Study Center.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Cultural Factors; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Psychological Studies; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Factors; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Japan

ABSTRACT

Three forms of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) were administered to 371 Japanese college students in order to measure their attitudes toward blacks, Koreans, and neutral persons without racial reference in 10 social and personal situations. Data were analyzed by analysis of variance and Scheffe post hoc comparisons. The subjects were found to respond negatively to both blacks and Koreans, but more so toward Koreans. Females responded more negatively than males to blacks and Koreans in situations involving potential physical harm. The overall pattern of responses of Japanese subjects on the SAS was similar to that of American or Danish subjects. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

DATA CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

ED120593

CS 010 419

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

1975

MEASURING JAPANESE RACIAL ATTITUDES

Stephen E. Forrer, William E. Sedlacek
and Nariyuki Agarie

Research Report # 4-75

The writers wish to thank Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr. of the Maryland Council for Higher Education for his assistance on the study.

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

MEASURING JAPANESE RACIAL ATTITUDES

Stephen E. Forrer, William E. Sedlacek and Nariyuki Agarie

Research Report # 4-75

SUMMARY

Three forms of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) were administered to 371 Japanese college students in order to measure their attitudes toward blacks, Koreans, and neutral persons without racial reference in 10 social and personal situations. Data were analyzed by analysis of variance and Scheffé post hoc comparisons. The subjects were found to respond negatively to both blacks and Koreans, but more so toward Koreans. Females responded more negatively than males to blacks and Koreans in situations involving potential physical harm. The overall pattern of responses of Japanese subjects on the SAS was similar to that of American or Danish subjects.

The study of attitudes toward minority groups has been of recent interest in the United States. Specifically, studies dealing with white attitudes toward blacks have been useful in understanding the scope and dimension of prejudice and discrimination against outgroups. Common problems exist, however, in instrumentation that make attitudinal measurement unreliable and difficult. To meet those methodological problems Sedlacek and Brooks (1970, 1972a) have designed an approach intended to improve accuracy in measuring prejudicial attitudes.

The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was developed to measure the degree of prejudicial attitudes which one group holds for another. Initially, the SAS was used to evaluate attitudes of whites toward blacks in the United States. To provide an appropriate context and make psychological withdrawal from the instrument difficult, ten personal and social situations, with some relevance to a racial response, were created. These situations represent instances where the prejudicial attitudes of one group toward another group might be relevant to one's attitude about the situation involved. For each situation 10 bipolar semantic differential scales were developed making a total of 100 items (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957). For use with United States subjects, two forms (A and B) were developed. Each form contains the same situations, bipolar scales and instructions except the word "black" was inserted into each situation of form B (see Table 1). The positive pole for each item was varied randomly from right to left.

Studies in the United States have shown that whites generally feel negatively toward blacks, except when blacks are in a service role (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970, 1972a; Ball, 1971; Eberly, 1972; Sedlacek, Brooks and Mindus, 1973; Whaples, 1974).

Chaples, Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) and Brooks, Sedlacek and Chaples (1974) have successfully translated the SAS into Danish. In the Danish studies, a third

form was also developed to measure attitudes toward a relevant Danish outgroup: Mediterranean foreign workers. Results of analysis of variance and Scheffé post hoc comparisons indicated that while Danes were consistently pro-black, they had strong negative feelings toward Mediterranean foreign workers. Specifically, Danes viewed Mediterranean foreign workers much as whites from the United States view blacks. With certain limitations the SAS proved successful in measuring Danish racial attitudes.

The study of Japanese racial attitudes has been fairly recent and has, in most cases, employed methods and techniques developed in western culture. For example, Akita (1964) used the Osgood semantic differential method in assessing national prejudice among college students concerning 12 nationalities. Another study by Akita (1968) indicates that six traits most frequently assigned to blacks by Japanese students included black, poor, manly, unhappy, ugly and restless.

It might be assumed that many of the methodological concerns affecting accurate data collection in the United States may also apply to the Japanese culture. Further exploration of the attitudes of Japanese toward blacks might help identify the specific form of prejudice in Japan. The determination of the generality of prejudice across cultures will be useful.

Following the lead of Chaples, Sedlacek and Brooks (1972), a third racial group representing a relevant outgroup for the Japanese was identified in this study. Some 640,000 Korean residents represent 86 percent of the total legal aliens in Japan. Though the latter accounts for only 7 tenths of 1 percent of the total population, they have been traditionally regarded as representing a relevant outgroup in Japan. This assumption was further supported by Akita (1964) who found that Koreans and blacks consistently clustered together as being seen negatively. The most frequent traits attributed to Koreans in Akita's study

were poor, unhappy, unclean, petty, unsociable and dark. For use with Japanese students, forms A and B of the SAS were translated from English to Japanese and back to English again to achieve as nearly a verbatim translation as possible. In addition, a form K was developed to measure prejudicial attitudes toward Koreans (see Table 1).[1]

Method

The three forms of the SAS were administered to 371 students at Seinan Gakuin Daigaku (Fukuoka), Osaka Kyoiku Daigaku (Osaka), and Hiroshima Shudo Daigaku (Hiroshima). The forms were administered during regularly scheduled class meetings. A total of 15 questionnaires were not included in the analysis because these respondents left more than 10 items blank. The median scale value (scale 0 to 4; 2 = median) was assigned to any missing response, providing there were 10 items or less blank on a questionnaire. The final usable *N* was 356: 122 form A's, 139 form B's and 95 form K's. Males represented 199 of the usable *N* and females totaled 157.

Course instructors, briefed in the use of the SAS, administered the instrument. The different forms of the questionnaire were randomly distributed in each class with each participant having approximately equal chance of receiving any of the three forms. The respondents were not aware of the different forms nor was this fact discovered.

Additionally, a short demographic questionnaire was attached to each SAS. This study attempted to replicate the original study by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970). The participants were drawn from a number of curricular areas including social science, English, education, science and medicine. The respondents represented a cross section of the first three years of academic work.

[1] A copy of the SAS in Japanese (3 forms) is available from William E. Sedlacek, Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA.

Results

An analysis of variance with form (A, B, K) and sex as main effects was conducted. The result of this analysis indicated that 61 of the 100 items were statistically significant (.05 level) for form, while 36 items were significant for sex, and 5 items for the form by sex interaction. Since, according to Sakoda, Cohen and Beall (1954), 9 items out of 100 would be significant by chance, it can be concluded that response varied depending on sex and whether form A, B or K was used, but that there was no difference due to the interaction of form and sex.

Of the 36 items that were significant for the sex factor, 23 items indicated more positive attitudes by females. Of the 13 items showing significantly negative female attitudes, 8 occurred in situation II (man raped woman) and 3 in situation IV (loitering men). In general, then, females tend to respond more negatively to situations involving possible personal harm than do males.

Table 2 shows the results when *F* values are computed for each combination of forms used in this experiment. This allows the measurement of the degree of difference which results from the insertion of the word "black" in the social situations used in the SAS. Following the use of Scheffé's (1959) method of post hoc comparisons, 46 of the 100 items showed significant differences between forms A and B (.10 level). Post hoc results comparing forms A and K, measuring the effects of the insertion of "Korean," indicate 48 of the items showed significant differences between forms (.10 level). Sixteen items were found significant (Scheffé - .10 level) in comparing blacks and Koreans (B and K).

When comparisons between form A and form B are examined, differential attitudes are evident. In situation III (man selling magazines) more positive attitudes are generally expressed toward blacks. Respondents are more cautious, unexcited, angered, annoyed, suspicious, and intolerant toward neutral persons without racial

reference. The only unfavorable attitude toward blacks is one of being startled by a black man selling magazines, a rather natural response considering the low visibility of blacks in Japan. It appears, therefore, that Japanese college students are actually more receptive, less angered, and less annoyed in the presence of black salesmen. Many Japanese are highly negative toward salesmen as they are incessantly bothered by them. Black salesmen, so rare and unexpected, might be expected to have disinhibitory effects. Similar responses are found by examining situations IV, VI, and IX. Respondents felt angered, less safe and unfriendly when passing a corner of loitering men (neutral) when compared with loitering black men. Similarly, being stopped by a neutral person elicits more feelings of suspicion, fear, unfriendliness, bitterness and inferiority than when compared with a black policeman. Witnessing a campus demonstration of neutral persons again results in negative feelings of indifference, suspicion, threat, unjustification, hate, etc. Japanese college students are generally tired of campus demonstrations which, to them, have become repetitive, simplistic and annoying. Demonstrations staged by blacks, should they occur, could be expected to draw decidedly more favorable reactions.

Situation V, however, indicates more negative feelings toward blacks. Having a friend become engaged to a black elicits feelings of sadness, passiveness, anger, hopelessness, less excitement and disgust when compared to the neutral referent person in the same situation.

There are some similarities of attitudes toward blacks when compared with Koreans. Respondents indicated positive feelings toward Koreans selling magazines (situation III) although not to the same extent as blacks in that role. A similar effect is noted in situation VI (stopped by a Korean policeman). Respondents feel less nervous, more trusting, safe, friendly, pleasant and cooperative. Responses to situation IX (campus demonstration) are those of understanding, trust, safety,

justification, and love. Similar interpretations, as suggested above, for the positive attitude may be applied. Situations III, VI, and IX appear to be inappropriate for the measurement of racial attitudes in Japan because of the strong sociological factors that influence the respondent's reactions toward the comparison group.

Definite negative racial attitudes toward Koreans do appear in situations I, II, VIII and X. The situation involving the moving of a new Korean family next door elicited feelings described as bad, unfriendly, sad, objectionable and undesirable. Additionally, the raping of a woman by a Korean (situation II) elicited negative feelings of disgust, repulsion, sadness and outrage. Situation V involving the engagement of a friend to a Korean evoked responses described as aggressive, sad, angry, hopeless, unexcited and disgusted. A similar generally negative response is seen toward Koreans in situation VIII (youngster steals) and to a lesser extent, situation X (only person standing).

The comparison of forms B and K yielded 16 items eliciting significantly different responses. Nine of these 16 differences occurred in situations I (family moves next door), II (man raped woman), and III (man selling magazines). Observation of the means indicated more negative responses toward Koreans. Situation X (only person standing), however, yielded three significant items with Koreans seen as more positive when compared with blacks.

It is also interesting to note that the differences in responses of Japanese males and females were similar to those of American males and females (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972b). That is, women expressed more negative reactions to situations involving potential fear of physical harm.

The results of the present study are mixed. Aside from the Akita studies, several studies have indicated that blacks and Koreans are the two least preferred

racial or ethnic groups for Japanese. Kusunoki (1949) (cited in Suzuki, 1969) shows that Koreans and blacks are the least liked racial or ethnic groups among 15 included in his study. Suzuki (1965) (cited in Suzuki, 1969) similarly found those two groups as least preferred, second only to Filipinos (not included in the Kusunoki study) among 10 racial groups.

The SAS was moderately successful in revealing racial prejudice of Japanese college students in situations such as I and II with regard to Koreans, V, VIII and X for both blacks and Koreans. The differential effect on each scale is quite characteristic of the SAS. As with American respondents, the relatively greater negative feelings toward outgroups in more personal situations (I, II, V, X) indicate more subtle, prejudicial attitudes.

These results indicate general patterns which support previous studies. Japanese students respond generally negatively to Koreans and somewhat negatively toward blacks. The negative response to blacks might be due to the media image of blacks as transmitted to Japan over the years. Blacks do not represent a significant social outcast group as very few actually live in Japan. The Koreans, however, represent a more serious, frustrating and sensitive "problem" for the Japanese; the solution of which has been blocked by deep seated distrust and antipathy on both sides, and has been further confounded by the political partition of Korea at the end of World War II.

The results of this study are not as clearcut as when the SAS was used with Americans and Danes. However, there are general patterns which emerge. Although the Japanese culture appears quite western in urban areas, there are cultural patterns which do not have a corresponding meaning in western society. Thus, while the SAS appears useful, it is not as appropriate an instrument when

transported to the Japanese culture. However, the fact that many interpretable significant differences did, in fact, appear lends credence to the use of the SAS technique in a variety of settings.

References

Akita, K. National prejudice among students of one Japanese college. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters*, Doshisha University, 1964, *70*, 28-47.

Akita, K. A study of race prejudice by the semantic differential method. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters*, Doshisha University, 1968, *104*, 10-38.

Ball, H. W. Racial attitudes of white educators in a situational context. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Maryland, 1971.

Brooks, G. C., Jr., Sedlacek, W. E., & Chaples, E. A. A cross-cultural comparison of Danish and U.S. racial attitudes. *Research in Higher Education*, 1974, *2*, 207-220.

Chaples, E. A., Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring prejudicial attitudes in a situational context: A report on a Danish experiment. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 1972, *7*, 235-247.

Eberly, C. G. An alternative analysis for the Situational Attitude Scale. *Office of Evaluation Services Research Report # 5*, Michigan State University, 1972.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Sakoda, J. M., Cohen, B. H., & Beall, G. Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1954, *51*, 172-175.

Scheffé, H. T. *The analysis of variance*. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. *Psychological Reports*, 1970, *27*, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. *Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) manual*. Chicago: Natresources, Inc., 1972a.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Differences in racial attitudes of white males and females. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 2-72*, University of Maryland, 1972b.

Sedlacek, W. E., Brooks, G. C., Jr., & Mindus, L. A. Racial attitudes of white university students and their parents. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1973, *14*, 517-520.

Suzuki, T. *Contemporary discrimination and prejudice*. Tokyo: Shinsensa Publishing, 1969.

Whaples, G. C. *Attitudes toward blacks of white adults involved in 4-H youth programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service 4-H Intern Report, 1974.

TABLE 1

Instructions and Situations from the Situational Attitude Scale*

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date

happy A B C D E sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you may feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

Form A	Form B	Form K
I. A new family moves in next door to you.	A new black family moves in next door to you.	A new Korean family moves in next door to you.
II. You read in the paper that a man has raped a woman.	You read in the paper that a black man has raped a white woman.	You read in the paper that a Korean man has raped a woman.
III. It is evening and a man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a Korean man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.
IV. You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young black men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young Korean men are loitering.
V. Your best friend has just become engaged.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a Korean person.
VI. You are stopped for speeding by a policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a policeman who is a Korean.
VII. A new person joins your social group.	A new black person joins your social group.	A new Korean person joins your social group.
III. You see a youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see a black youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see a Korean child steal something in a dimestore.
IX. Some students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some black students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some Korean students on campus stage a demonstration.
X. You get on a bus and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all black people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all Korean people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.

* The Situational Attitude Scale is copyrighted and available from Natresources, Inc., 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and *F* Values for Forms A, B, and K[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (*N*=122) MEAN	FORM A (*N*=122) S.D.	FORM B (*N*=139) MEAN	FORM B (*N*=139) S.D.	FORM K (*N*=95) MEAN	FORM K (*N*=95) S.D.	*F* VALUES FORM A TO B	*F* VALUES FORM A TO K	*F* VALUES FORM B TO K
	I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR									
1	good-bad	1.54	0.72	1.72	0.84	1.81	0.95	3.28	5.44*	0.57
2	safe-unsafe	1.71	0.75	1.49	0.96	1.58	0.92	4.23	1.26	0.54
3	angry-not angry	2.94	1.00	2.69	1.15	2.79	1.12	3.37	1.06	0.40
4	friendly-unfriendly	1.27	0.81	1.40	0.93	1.65	0.99	1.38	9.12*	3.66
5	sympathetic-not sympathetic	2.16	0.83	2.04	0.81	2.12	1.15	1.23	0.07	0.35
6	nervous-calm	2.68	0.98	2.76	0.95	2.78	1.00	0.46	0.56	0.03
7	happy-sad	1.74	0.68	1.85	0.63	2.06	0.36	2.13	17.73*	8.58*
8	objectionable-acceptable	2.58	0.73	2.47	0.87	2.21	0.84	1.23	11.78*	4.99*
9	desirable-undesirable	1.77	0.61	1.93	0.68	2.23	0.63	4.18	28.53*	11.02*
10	suspicious-trusting	2.28	0.78	2.45	0.87	2.35	0.79	2.75	0.42	0.78
	II. MAN RAPED WOMAN									
11	affection disgust	3.12	0.96	3.23	0.86	3.50	0.76	0.70	9.69*	6.67*
12	relish-repulsion	2.11	1.36	2.61	1.18	3.19	1.02	10.26*	40.29*	14.41*
13	happy-sad	2.85	0.86	3.05	0.85	3.44	0.73	3.50	27.41*	12.68*
14	friendly-hostile	3.02	0.88	2.91	0.86	3.13	0.82	1.06	0.95	3.97
15	uninvolved-involved	1.85	1.24	1.74	1.10	1.88	1.03	0.61	0.03	0.95
16	hope-hopelessness	2.50	0.73	2.50	0.73	2.58	0.74	0.00	0.71	0.75
17	aloof-outraged	2.65	1.01	2.77	0.94	3.00	0.90	0.88	6.73*	3.47
18	injure-kill	1.89	0.75	1.85	0.49	1.83	0.64	0.24	0.35	0.06
19	safe-fearful	2.75	0.93	2.79	0.83	2.82	0.86	0.11	0.33	0.09
20	emphathetic-can't understand	2.33	1.02	2.29	0.92	2.56	0.96	0.14	2.78	4.79*
	III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES									
21	relaxed-startled	2.92	0.73	3.22	0.78	3.04	0.80	10.21*	1.45	2.68
22	receptive-cautious	3.26	0.68	2.88	0.86	3.08	0.85	15.36*	3.20	2.82
23	excited-unexcited	2.06	0.90	1.75	1.04	2.08	0.92	6.36*	0.02	5.88*
24	glad-angered	2.53	0.68	2.03	0.42	2.18	0.41	51.33*	19.06*	6.80*
25	pleased-annoyed	2.68	0.66	2.26	0.60	2.37	0.59	28.04*	12.04*	1.90
26	indifferent-suspicious	2.64	1.04	2.30	0.91	2.10	1.16	7.36*	12.49*	2.26
27	tolerable-intolerable	2.29	0.87	1.64	0.79	1.64	0.97	39.86*	26.35*	0.00
28	afraid-secure	1.61	0.75	1.80	0.87	1.73	0.92	3.30	0.98	0.34
29	friend-enemy	2.54	0.62	1.74	0.60	2.06	0.53	61.02*	33.80*	2.54
30	unprotected-protected	2.03	0.88	1.93	0.81	2.10	0.73	1.01	0.33	2.66

[a]Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
[b]See Table 1 for complete situation.
*F values significant beyond .10 (Scheffé).

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and *F* Values for Forms A, B, and K[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (*N*=122) MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B (*N*=139) MEAN	FORM B S.D.	FORM K (*N*=95) MEAN	FORM K S.D.	*F* VALUES FORM A TO B	FORM A TO K	FORM B TO K
	IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN									
31	relaxed-tensed	3.26	0.65	3.26	0.79	3.26	0.79	0.01	0.04	0.01
32	pleased-angered	2.46	0.59	2.26	0.53	2.35	0.60	8.16*	1.80	1.37
33	superior-inferior	2.21	0.73	2.13	0.59	2.06	0.41	0.83	2.71	0.84
34	smarter-dumber	1.33	0.80	1.43	0.71	1.63	0.75	1.12	7.45*	3.92*
35	whiter-blacker	2.51	0.83	2.11	0.75	2.16	0.52	16.73*	12.34*	0.37
36	aggressive-passive	2.36	1.03	2.45	0.91	2.45	0.87	0.46	0.42	0.00
37	safe-unsafe	2.97	0.77	2.69	0.81	2.68	0.80	8.57*	7.32*	0.00
38	friendly-unfriendly	3.07	0.70	2.37	0.82	2.39	0.72	52.27*	47.34*	0.01
39	excited-unexcited	1.31	0.80	1.28	0.85	1.63	0.84	0.08	7.63*	8.95*
40	trivial-important	2.03	0.93	2.13	0.93	2.03	0.73	0.72	0.00	0.72
	V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED									
41	aggressive-passive	1.93	0.71	2.13	0.61	2.18	0.67	6.36*	7.24*	0.35
42	happy-sad	1.02	0.95	1.57	0.81	1.44	0.89	25.21*	11.19*	1.21
43	tolerable-intolerable	1.29	0.93	1.20	0.96	1.23	1.00	0.67	0.27	0.04
44	complimented-insulted	1.91	0.57	1.83	0.65	1.83	0.70	1.06	0.88	0.00
45	angered-overjoyed	2.62	0.83	2.26	0.70	2.18	0.66	14.17*	17.77*	0.79
46	secure-fearful	1.45	0.82	1.60	0.91	1.59	0.95	1.98	1.35	0.00
47	hopeful-hopeless	1.48	0.97	1.79	0.88	1.87	0.87	7.65*	9.51*	0.42
48	excited-unexcited	1.30	0.76	1.65	0.93	1.96	0.88	10.41*	33.92*	6.38*
49	right-wrong	1.44	0.89	1.29	0.95	1.30	0.95	1.84	1.25	0.01
50	disgusting-pleasing	2.67	0.90	2.22	0.95	2.26	0.79	15.38*	12.46*	0.09
	VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN									
51	calm-nervous	3.01	0.94	2.27	1.12	2.00	1.73	32.80*	50.78*	3.04
52	trusting-suspicious	2.16	1.10	1.22	1.04	1.13	0.99	50.16*	50.76*	0.44
53	afraid-safe	1.08	0.83	2.21	1.12	2.27	1.10	82.06*	81.00*	0.18
54	friendly-unfriendly	2.57	1.03	1.79	1.03	1.84	0.97	37.05*	28.32*	0.11
55	tolerant-intolerant	1.51	1.10	1.33	0.91	1.25	0.93	2.00	3.38	0.46
56	bitter-pleasant	0.83	0.79	1.50	0.76	1.66	0.68	47.52*	64.18*	2.52
57	cooperative-uncooperative	1.67	1.14	1.34	1.08	1.09	0.96	5.86*	15.44*	3.04
58	acceptive-belligerent	1.13	0.94	1.22	0.99	1.01	0.86	0.55	0.93	2.75
59	inferior-superior	1.43	0.77	1.90	0.58	1.91	0.52	32.01*	27.53*	0.02
60	smarter-dumber	1.99	0.95	1.94	0.59	2.03	0.37	0.27	0.15	1.72

[a]Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
[b]See Table 1 for complete situation.
**F* values significant beyond .10 (Scheffé).

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and *F* Values for Forms A, B, and K[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] / BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (*N*=122) MEAN	FORM A (*N*=122) S.D.	FORM B (*N*=139) MEAN	FORM B (*N*=139) S.D.	FORM K (*N*=95) MEAN	FORM K (*N*=95) S.D.	*F* VALUES FORM A TO B	*F* VALUES FORM A TO K	*F* VALUES FORM B TO K
	VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP									
61	warm-cold	1.32	0.85	1.24	0.91	1.29	0.89	0.49	0.06	0.15
62	sad-happy	2.70	0.72	2.57	0.84	2.43	0.80	1.79	6.95*	1.67
63	superior-inferior	1.74	0.63	1.89	0.48	1.86	0.45	4.82*	2.53	0.21
64	threatened-neutral	2.44	0.91	2.85	0.96	3.03	0.99	11.84*	20.25*	2.04
65	pleased-displeased	1.56	0.76	1.63	0.81	1.78	0.78	0.46	4.30	2.04
66	understanding-indifferent	1.25	0.84	1.29	1.05	1.36	1.08	0.12	0.84	0.30
67	suspicious-trusting	2.46	0.84	2.65	0.89	2.71	0.92	3.01	4.32	0.27
68	disappointed-elated	2.06	0.46	2.12	0.54	2.04	0.44	0.68	0.13	1.20
69	favorable-unfavorable	1.19	0.73	1.14	0.84	1.18	0.91	0.34	0.01	0.11
70	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.10	0.65	2.15	0.71	2.23	0.71	0.44	1.88	0.56
	VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS									
71	surprising-not surprising	0.98	1.02	1.42	1.06	1.44	1.14	11.19*	9.52*	0.02
72	sad-happy	0.93	0.76	0.94	0.71	0.91	0.83	0.03	0.01	0.07
73	disinterested-interested	2.79	1.00	2.32	0.94	2.09	1.09	15.65*	24.44*	2.90
74	close-distant	1.92	1.20	2.39	1.20	2.39	1.27	10.22*	7.65*	0.00
75	understandable-baffling	1.87	1.04	1.91	1.00	2.12	1.18	0.11	2.69	2.04
76	responsible-not responsible	1.94	1.08	1.85	1.02	1.78	1.19	0.55	1.03	0.17
77	concerned-unconcerned	1.96	1.18	2.18	1.08	2.31	1.22	2.38	4.60*	0.78
78	sympathy-indifference	1.72	0.91	1.82	0.97	2.09	1.10	0.76	7.45*	3.93
79	expected-unexpected	2.36	1.08	2.72	1.02	2.55	1.07	1.14	1.60	5.47*
80	hopeful-hopeless	2.60	0.79	2.35	0.77	2.33	0.77	6.34*	6.07*	0.04
	IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION									
81	bad-good	1.97	0.80	2.14	0.83	2.21	0.84	2.56	4.46	0.43
82	understanding-indifferent	2.22	1.20	1.75	1.09	1.84	1.21	10.50*	5.11*	0.33
83	suspicious-trusting	1.62	0.85	2.19	0.70	2.25	0.71	34.79*	33.86*	0.47
84	safe-unsafe	2.41	0.90	1.98	0.86	2.04	0.85	14.50*	8.86*	0.25
85	disturbed-undisturbed	1.86	0.99	1.95	1.02	1.93	1.05	0.50	0.22	0.03
86	justified-unjustified	2.18	0.98	1.74	0.82	1.75	0.73	15.12*	12.98*	0.00
87	tense-calm	1.89	1.11	1.81	1.00	1.71	1.09	0.39	1.41	0.49
88	hate-love	1.94	0.59	2.13	0.58	2.14	0.52	6.68*	6.40*	0.00
89	wrong-right	2.04	0.86	2.31	0.73	2.21	0.75	7.62*	2.36	1.06
90	humorous-serious	2.25	0.67	2.10	0.44	2.15	0.44	4.31	1.52	0.63

[a]Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
[b]See Table 1 for complete situation.
**F* values significant beyond .10 (Scheffé).

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and *F* Values for Forms A, B, and K[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (*N*=122) MEAN	FORM A (*N*=122) S.D.	FORM B (*N*=139) MEAN	FORM B (*N*=139) S.D.	FORM K (*N*=95) MEAN	FORM K (*N*=95) S.D.	*F* VALUES FORM A TO B	*F* VALUES FORM A TO K	*F* VALUES FORM B TO K
	X. ONLY PERSON STANDING									
91	fearful-secure	2.14	0.82	1.65	0.99	1.76	1.05	18.54*	8.62*	0.73
92	tolerable-intolerable	0.96	0.99	1.55	1.07	1.38	1.10	20.24*	3.48*	1.29
93	hostile-indifferent	2.65	0.98	2.15	0.86	2.50	0.87	18.43*	1.26	8.96*
94	important-trivial	2.76	0.99	1.93	0.91	2.45	1.00	49.38*	5.24	16.70*
95	conspicuous-inconspicuous	1.20	0.96	0.85	0.83	1.44	1.12	9.88*	2.59	20.39*
96	calm-anxious	1.76	1.15	2.39	1.11	2.28	1.15	19.89*	10.69*	0.54
97	indignant-understanding	2.41	0.77	2.15	0.77	2.30	0.77	7.25*	1.02	2.15
98	comfortable-uncomfortable	2.66	0.78	2.74	0.76	2.73	0.82	0.63	0.44	0.00
99	hate-love	1.93	0.43	1.98	0.55	2.02	0.51	0.71	2.23	0.37
100	not resentful-resentful	1.37	0.98	1.73	0.95	1.54	0.90	8.89*	1.73	2.26

[a]Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
[b]See Table 1 for complete situation.
**F* values significant beyond .10 (Scheffé).